

RECEIVED

EIS000671

NOV 09 1999
Mike Baughman

6 MR. BAUGHMAN: Thank you. I'll try to be brief
7 since we're running out of time and we have others.

8 I just want to indicate that I concur with Miss
9 Johnston and Dr. Klomp with regarding the potential inevitably
10 of this project and I think they raise a good point, and I
11 think it's important as the County and City have worked hard
12 again to seek and minimize risk, to seek to minimize impacts
1 13 and to maximize benefits that we ask ourselves -- and I think
14 the EIS must answer -- which of the transportation routes and
15 modes does minimize the risk and does minimize impacts, and it
16 appears to me as I look at that document that you're not able
17 to tell, and I had actually asked -- anticipated asking that as
18 a question and we'll do that, can DOE tell us which of the
19 routes and modes minimize risk?

2... 20 Now if we assume that the Chalk Mountain route
21 may do that, and let me caveat this by noting that if we again
22 assume that it is the will of the nation to bring this project
23 to Nevada and -- and it is the will of the governor to keep
24 waste out of Las Vegas, which he has done with low-level waste,
25 then we must assume that radioactive waste will flow into rural

1 Nevada, and given the rural routes, I have to -- I have to
2 think that the Chalk Mountain route probably is the route,
3 particularly a rail alternative which, does minimize risks and
4 impacts, and the fact that the US Air Force opposes this route
5 as the EIS indicates for adverse effects on security operations
6 begs the question exactly what are those adverse effects?

7 How many people will die as a result of our

/

2...

8 shipping waste across the Chalk Mountain route?

9 If it is fewer people than will die as a result
10 of highway accidents and shipping it around the Nevada Test
11 Site, then it strikes me as though if it's in our national
12 interest to use a route which reduces the transportation risks
13 and fatalities, and I think it's incumbent upon the EIS to
14 demonstrate exactly what are the concerns of the Air Force are
15 and to evaluate what options are maybe to mitigate those so
16 that the people of Nevada can perhaps enjoy as best they can a
17 highway system which is not crowded about radioactive waste
18 shipments and we can defer those shipments to a secure location
19 such as the Nellis range and Nevada Test Site.

5

20 I would just note that if we're worried about
21 sabotage and terrorism, which I think we should be, I would
22 only hope that those shipments once on the Nellis range and
23 under the cover and constant vigilance of our United States Air
24 Force will be less subject to terrorize -- terrorism and
25 sabotage than if they're out on the public highway someplace.

...2

1 I would also suggest that once on the Nellis
2 range and the Nevada Test Site, they ought to be -- there ought
3 to be less potential for human exposure because those are non-
4 populated areas.

5 Finally, I would note that the transportation
6 risk, the accident risks ought to be minimized because they're
7 not on the public highway.

3

8 I would also note that the County and City in
9 Lincoln County have recently prepared a plan, a radiological
10 emergency response plan, medical response plan for the

11 Grovercitos Medical Center.

12 The EIS is absolutely silent on the needs for
13 enhancements to medical services and capabilities to handle
14 radiologically contaminated patients.

15 This plan will tell you -- and I will give a copy
16 to the staff -- that the hospital is currently not prepared to
17 handle a contaminated patient, and we have to assume that they
18 may have to do that some day, and the EIS is clearly deficient
19 by having not evaluated what that need is and what the needs of
20 the hospital are.

4 21 Finally, I will also provide you with a copy of
22 a -- of a paper that was written by myself and a couple other
23 colleagues for the County and the City which actually is
24 probably the only study that took a look at the tourism impacts
25 of TMI and related the potential for those impacts on accidents

1 that might occur in Nevada, and I would just recall -- or
2 remind the DOE that the EIS is silent on this, I believe, as
3 well, that there are five State Parks in Lincoln County.

4 Lincoln County is an ever more popular playground
5 for the residents of Clark County, and if Nevada's to continue
6 to grow and to prosper, I think you need to have those
7 recreation alternatives available to the residents of Clark
8 County.

9 This paper will tell you -- and we have provided
10 this to DOE in the past and they failed to use it --
11 that -- that if an accident were to occur on the rail line or
12 to the highway system within twenty or thirty miles of one of
13 these five State Parks, that we might be facing a -- a fifty

14 percent reduction in sales and hotel occupancy for a period of
15 perhaps eight weeks.

16 If an accident occurred thirty to sixty miles
17 from one of these five State Parks, we might be looking at
18 impacts that last two to six weeks, and a worst case analysis
19 we're looking at fiscal and economic impacts to Lincoln County
20 of about a million dollars.

21 Small change when you compare it to Clark County
22 and overall gaming economy and that's why the governor wants to
23 keep the waste out of Clark County, but what do the folks in
24 Lincoln County do when faced with this kind of unforeseen
25 impact?

1 I think it's incumbent upon the EIS to evaluate
2 this possibility, and in terms of mitigation, we have
3 recommended that the mitigation plan be developed that would
4 immediately put in place a marketing program, no questions
5 asked. You have an accident, the program goes into effect and
6 we immediately begin to try and overcome the loss of tourism
7 resulting from an accident like that, and I would just point
8 out that the media will have a field day with any kind of an
9 incident or accident involving radioactive waste, and to a
10 certain extent, the -- the impacts that will result have to be
11 laying on the doorstep on the media and perhaps any state or
12 local officials that would tend to exacerbate the public
13 perception of risk because it's largely a perception that's
14 driving these impacts.

15 And with that, I will yield to someone else.

16 Thank you.